

[1st November 1935]

(g) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table the report or reports received regarding the recent floods in the Ganjam district?

A.—(a), (b) & (g) Copies of the reports received from the Collector are laid on the table.*

(c) In addition to the steps taken by the Collector as detailed in his reports, the Government have sanctioned sums aggregating Rs. 1,500 (rupees one thousand five hundred only) for relief of distress.

(d), (e) & (f) The Government have not the information, but have called for a report from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908, FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL No. 12 OF 1931).

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu will continue his speech.”

* Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“Sir, the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili was referring to the cumulative effect of the various provisions of the Bill which is proposed to be introduced by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. He said that the Bill will cut down the income of the zamindars to a very material extent, to at least 50 per cent. Whatever may be the effect of the provisions of Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill and even though these provisions were, according to him, of such a serious nature, he called a conference of the ryots' representatives who were willing to co-operate with him and to collaborate and discuss the provisions of the Bill. I will be able to show from the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the draft Bill, what the attitude of the ryots' representatives who discussed the Bill was, and how unfounded were the apprehensions of the hon. the Raja of Bobbili in this matter.

“I would ask the hon. the Revenue Member to say whether, after all, Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill is so confiscatory as the hon. the Raja Sahib would put it and, if the provisions are bad, to remedy them, and to amend the provisions suitably.

“The Raja Sahib of Khallikote was saying that the zamindars have to meet the peshkash and the charges of the Government punctually. If not, the Collector does not hesitate to attach the properties; so the zamindars have to pay the peshkash and the bill of the Government punctually. Let us see the other side. Are the zamindars satisfied that their ryots are in a position to pay the kist punctually and without any difficulty whatever? Do they think that the ryot has got money full in his pocket and he has to be simply asked to pay and that he will do so? He is in a worse position than the zamindar in this matter. He is groaning under heavy taxation; not a single day passes, not a

1st November 1933] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

single hour passes, without complaints not merely from the zamindari tenants but also from the ryotwari ryots, not merely on the platforms but also through their representatives in this very House. Therefore, the time has come to consider how to relieve the ryot of his heavy burden. It was only the other day that you, Sir, read the address of His Excellency the Governor in which he pointed out that, after requesting the Government for remission of kist, it does not come with good grace to ask also for the improvement of the nation-building departments. I put the same question now to the other side. The zamindars seem to think 'we have to get on with our departments even as the Government has got to go on with their departments.' We have to find money somehow; the Government get money from the ryotwari tenants; the zamindars have to get the money somehow from their tenants. That being the attitude, it is no wonder that the landlords have asked the hon. the Revenue Member to push on with his Bill.

"Leaving that aspect of the question, I will now come to the motion before the House. It is our request in this motion that the hon. the Revenue Member should give us a chance of discussing the various provisions of the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti, by giving leave to him to introduce the Bill and of considering how far and to what extent those provisions may be incorporated in the Government Bill. My hon. Friend, Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti, referred to some of the provisions of his Bill. The question was put and put pertinently by the hon. the Chief Minister 'on whose behalf are you introducing the Bill and what is the following behind you?' I am glad he put this question in this very House. The first copy of the Bill that I got—a printed copy—was through the Raja Sahib himself. He was pleased to give me a printed copy of the Bill—a Bill to amend the Madras Estates Land Act drafted by Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu—some time in 1932. The hon. Gentleman himself gave us the copies of the Bill. The hon. Gentleman himself called Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti to the conference which he convened; now he asks what are your credentials to represent the ryots. This Bill was drafted by Mr. Ramadas Pantulu as he was the President of the Ryotwari Ryots Association in this Presidency. He was authorized to draft a Bill and he drafted it on behalf of the Zamindari Ryots Association. He was not a Member of this House and he had to ask some Members of this Council to introduce the Bill. The Bill was first balloted in the name of Mr. Satyanarayana Choudari. This time the ballot was in the name of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. The hon. the Revenue Member took us into the history of twenty years with regard to this Bill. He also told us about the three Committees that were constituted to discuss how the Bill should be amended. May I tell this House that Mr. Ramadas Pantulu was one of those who were invited by the late Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar when he was the Member in charge of the Bill? Mr. Ramadas Pantulu was one of the persons who were invited by the Raja Sahib to discuss the provisions of the Bill.

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st November 1933]

He was the person who was consulted on various occasions. He was the person with whom the Raja Sahib discussed for four hours the various provisions of the Bill. I would ask the hon. the Raja Sahib himself to answer his question 'who are you to present this Bill, what are your credentials?'

"I will ask the two representatives of the Landholders' Association, one the Secretary of the Association and the other a prominent vakil of the Association, to say 'as to what all we agreed to and to what extent there was the spirit of give-and-take. The draft Bill was circulated to us; a copy was placed in my hands on the 13th; it was represented to me that the draft was prepared in accordance with the discussion that took place on a previous occasion. This draft was prepared by the two members representing the Landholders' Association. The draft contained the provisions which in the opinion of the landholders were acceptable to them. I will refer to the Bill hereafter as Mr. Ramadas's Bill instead of Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill. You will see that the representatives of the landholders prepared the draft of their Bill and have amended the Statement of Objects and Reasons. They say:—

'The amendments to the Madras Estates Land Act suggested in the accompanying draft Bill are based upon the discussions at a conference held at "Branson Bagh."

An attempt has been made in this draft as far as possible to reconcile the rival view-points and evolve a formula which might be found acceptable to both parties.

The following are the principal points deserving special mention:—

Clause 2, sub-clause (2) of the Bill abolishes the category of old waste. The definition of old waste in the Estates Land Act comprised both ryoti and non-ryoti old waste and does not differentiate between the two though it was not the object of the Act to legislate in respect of uncultivable land. Sub-clause (1) requires evidence which it is difficult to secure as it is almost impossible for the landholder or ryot to adduce at this distance of time any reliable or satisfactory evidence as to whether the land in question was cultivated at any time within twenty years prior to the passing of the Act. Moreover, the ryots' representatives have been strongly pressing for the abolition of this category of land altogether, thereby bringing land which was previously treated as old waste under the category of ryoti land. This sub-clause would achieve the desired object subject, however, to the result of further discussions in the matter of the treatment of lankas.'

The question of lankas was generally discussed and it was deferred until this clause was finally settled.

'Clause 3 proceeds principally on the lines of clause 4 of Mr. Ramadas's draft Bill and provides for suspension of rent in certain cases. No provision has been made for remission of rent as it involves highly controversial issues altogether unacceptable to the landholders.'

"In Mr. Ramadas's Bill—i.e., Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill—there was provision for both remission and suspension. There was agreement so far as suspension was concerned:—

'Clause 5 seeks to clear a doubt which has arisen by reason of the somewhat conflicting views expressed by the High Court and Privy Council in 39 Madras, 944, and 42 Madras, 355, Privy Council respectively, regarding the meaning and effect of the explanation to section 6, sub-section (6) and section 8.'

1st November 1933] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

' Clause 6 follows section 5 (5) of the Bengal Tenancy Act and the last portion of the new section 6 suggested by Mr. Ramadas in his draft Bill. It lays down a much-needed presumption that persons holding large extent of land shall be regarded as ijarars or farmers of rent until the contrary is proved. The extent stated is borrowed from the Bengal Tenancy Act which refers to 100 baghas or 33½ acres. This clause would have the effect of facilitating the acquisition of occupancy rights by the under-tenants of persons holding large extent of ryoti land.'

" The Raja Sahib threw out a hint that those who are so keen about having the Bill amended are not keen about the actual cultivators; and, Sir, this is a provision for which he is going to take, probably his party also is going to take, credit. Yet, he has borrowed this from Mr. Ramadas's Bill: 11-45 a.m.

' Clause 7 lays down the detailed procedure for the demarcation and allotment of pasture of forest land wherever the same may be available for the grazing of cattle belonging to ryots. This clause marks a considerable improvement on the present state of things and provides an easy way of solving the difficulties of the ryots and of removing what has been a source of friction between landholders and ryots.'

" Sir, it is not my language, it is the language of their advisers. This 'has been a source of friction between landholders and ryots' and this question has assumed much importance in recent years not only on account of the economic value of the grazing rights but also on account of its being an effective weapon to control elections. In Mr. Ramadas's Bill, there are provisions for grazing facilities and they were also discussed, and the zamindars have in their draft provided what they consider to be a remedy for this long-felt hardship.

" Then clause 8:

' Contains a modified formula for enabling ryots to acquire the ownership of trees standing in their holdings on the 1st July 1908 on payment of proper compensation. It is claimed that this is an improvement on clause 8 of Mr. Ramadas's draft which is confiscatory in character. Sub-clause (2) saves the rights of third persons in such trees.'

It is said that this confiscatory clause has been made a more acceptable clause by the attitude adopted by tenant Members in this House; which attitude, the hon. the Revenue Member hopes, not to get hereafter.

' Clause 9: It has been stated that by reason of the heavy fall in prices in recent years the rents fixed some years ago during commutation proceedings under section 40 or at a settlement of rent are pressing harshly upon the ryots. Clause 9 provides for a proportionate abatement of rent on the ground of a fall in prices. The procedure laid down is easy and expeditious. No relief is to be claimed for a fall in prices if it is inconsiderable. The basis price figures for comparison are the price figures adopted at the time of commutation or settlement on the one hand and the prevailing prices in the year of application on the other. The clause proceeds somewhat on the lines of the formula evolved in the United Provinces for the adjustment of rent from year to year.'

' Clause 10: It may be doubted whether the language of section 40 is wide enough to cover cases where cash rents varying with the crop are payable. It has been stated that the system of collecting varying cash rents according to the crop raised is working serious hardship on the ryots in some estates and that it discourages the raising of the more valuable kinds of crops.'

I ask, Sir, who is it that stated this? This is a question that was discussed at the conference.

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st November 1933]

'Clause 10, sub-clause (1), suggests an amendment to clause 40 whereby such cases would clearly come under that section. The machinery provided in section 40 would thus be applicable to the class of cases mentioned above. Sub-clause (2) of clause 10 provides that where in the village or neighbouring villages similar lands held on zamindari tenure are not available for the purpose of comparison, the rates of rent prevailing in a neighbouring taluk may be referred to for purposes of comparison.'

That again was a provision in Mr. Ramadas's Bill.

"Clauses 11 to 18: You will observe the whole set of clauses deal with the repair of irrigation works and they all—

'Practically follow the clauses drafted by Mr. Ramdas. In view, however, of the stringent provisions of Mr. Ramadas's draft Bill, as for instance the clause which provides for the recovery from the landholder of the amount necessary for the repair of an irrigation work, as if it were an arrear of land revenue, it is necessary that there should be some provision to ensure that the amount which a landholder is called upon to pay in a particular year is not beyond his capacity. The local Government may for example advance to the landholder the necessary amount under the Agriculturists' Loans Act or otherwise and provide for its repayment in suitable instalments. The exact form in which an upward limit can be provided for the payment which a landholder may have to make in a single year in the matter of the repair of irrigation works in his estate either directly from out of his revenues or indirectly by way of discharge of a loan incurred for the purpose, will have to be decided at the conference.'

"Then:

'Clause 19 provides for the remission of rent pending the carrying out of repairs to irrigation works in a form slightly different from that suggested by Mr. Ramadas in his clause 35.'

'Clause 20 safeguards the rights of landholders against dasabandam inamdars and their alienees. The existing provisions of law in this particular are considered to be highly defective. It would, it is presumed, be agreed on all hands that the landholders should be clothed with the necessary powers for enforcing the legitimate liability which under the law falls on dasabandam inamdars and their alienees.'

So, these confiscatory representatives of the tenants have been willing to arm the landholders with necessary power to recover from them the amounts that they have to spend on the irrigation works.

'Clauses 21 and 22: Are drafted so as to meet the objections that are raised against the existing provisions in the matter of the survey and settlement of estates and the preparation of record of rights. The principal provisions in Mr. Ramadas's draft have been embodied in these clauses. Survey has been made compulsory. This is achieved by a thorough change in the language of section 164 (1). It is however obvious that the effect of making the survey compulsory would be to throw on the landholder all on a sudden a burden which he would find it impossible to bear. The provisions of the Survey and Boundaries Act in the matter of recovery of the cost of the survey from landholders are extremely stringent, and a suitable formula has therefore to be devised for spreading the cost over several years or otherwise for bringing the payment to be made by the landholder in any particular year within reasonable limits.'

You will find, Sir, that in the present Act, the provision is that the cost should be borne both by the landholders and the ryots. As a result of the conference and as a result of that Bill of Mr. Ramadas, the landowners have recognized the equity of bearing it themselves; only they wanted they should be enabled to make payment over a large number of instalments.

'Settlement may be applied for within one year after the final publication of record of rights instead of within two months as now. This is considered better than Mr. Ramadas's clause 42 which leaves the matter vague.'

A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908, 293
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL NO. 12 OF 1931)

1st November 1933] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

So the landholders have come happily to our rescue to make it more clear.

'The suggestion about the application for settlement being made by ryots holding one-eighth of the ryoti lands has been accepted but it is considered unnecessary and inexpedient to leave it to the local Government to order settlement of rents of its own motion.'

That is the quarrel between the Chief Minister and his hon. Colleague the Revenue Member here.

'The amendments suggested in the above two clauses give full effect to the main proposals made by Mr. Ramdas with the alterations above stated and are so drafted as to avoid unnecessary interference with the frame work of the chapter.'

'Clauses 23 and 24.—Give the ryots some protection against the extravagant demands of money-lenders. The new section 211-A provides that what is known as the damdupat rule should be applied to the mortgage debts of ryots. Sub-section (2) of section 211-A saves the existing powers and jurisdiction of courts in the matter of giving relief to debtors.'

With regard to the first clause, I would leave my Friend, the Raja Sahib of Bobbili and the Kumararaja of Chettinad, who belong to the money-lending profession to consider this provision.

'The objection raised on behalf of the ryots to the jurisdiction under the Madras Estates Land Act being exercised by itinerant officers can be met by the establishment of Stationary Deputy Collectors' courts one at least in each of the following districts.'

Then the districts follow:

'Executive instructions can also be immediately issued to the Sub-Collectors and Deputy Collectors to try cases arising under the Madras Estates Land Act at their headquarters.'

'Now, Sir, you will see that almost every one of the clauses of the draft Bill has been practically borrowed bodily from Mr. Ramdas's draft or has been so slightly altered here and there so as to take into consideration the difficulties which the landholders expressed. Then, they end the draft as below:—

'The draft Bill merely states in suitable language the principle points which were discussed at the conference, but it does not purport to contain or embody all the consequential changes, which have to be made in the other sections of the Act by reason of the amendments which are here set out.'

I am not drawing upon my imagination as to what was discussed or what was not discussed—this is only the result of the conference held at the Raja Sahib's house—

'A Bill complete in that sense and fit for introduction into the Legislative Council will have to be drafted after the principal amendments are finally settled and decided upon at the conference.'

'Then, Sir, what all happened is this: they drafted a Bill and Mr. Ramdas issued a statement. The Raja Sahib was not here; and afterwards when he arrived, he went to Mr. Ramdas. They discussed everything for four hours on two days; they came to some understanding, and possibly as a result of that deliberation this Bill was revised and circulated to all of us. What the original Bill as drafted was, we do not know; but the Bill as drafted after the discussion with Mr. Ramdas reached our hands. And there are sections in it which

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st November 1933]

have been almost modelled upon Mr. Ramdas's Bill; and these sections were the basis on which a compromise was talked of between the two parties. Whatever effect these sections may or may not have, I certainly say that the statement made by the Raja Sahib that the return from the estates would be reduced by 50 per cent cannot be accepted as wholly correct. It is not also stated as to what effect the other provisions may have on the present position. The Bill with all its provisions is still open for discussion. Whatever that may be, we have something like twenty clauses on matters which are covered by the Bill on which there was a spirit to compromise; but what really has happened is that a chance has not been given to us to talk over this draft Bill in order to find out to what extent it can be modified. We find that that draft Bill has been put into the hands of the hon. the Revenue Member. I do not know, however, if he has been furnished with a copy of the Statement of Objects and Reasons for these amendments. If he had been, probably he would have taken the trouble of trying to consult whomsoever he considered to be representatives of the ryots on those matters.

"Now, Sir, there is one other point. The Bill does not stop there; it proceeds further and says:—

'The following provisions are not to be found in Mr. Ramadas's draft. —I am not going to take more time of the House than is absolutely necessary, Sir—

'Clause 2, sub-clause (1) which brings all pre-settlement major inams under the definition of an "estate"'

That is a think for which the Raja Sahib would take credit as one which has been evolved by him; but, Sir, I may point out that it has been in the original Bill of 1908; in the Bills of 1921, 1922 and even of 1931, it was there. It was unfortunately due to the turn that took place in the Select Committee that the Government's intentions could not be effected, and I am glad that the Raja Sahib has seen to it that he should conform to what the Government's intentions have always been all these years.

'Clause 4 which seeks to introduce a new section regularizing the relative rights and liabilities of landholders and trespassers on ryoti land.'

That I think was already provided for in the Bill which went to the Select Committee; it is also in the Select Committee Bill. Again,

'Clause 20 which elaborately deals with the rights of landholders against desabandam inamdars and their alienees.'

That is no doubt an improvement both upon the Select Committee Bill and upon Mr. Ramdas's Bill.

"Lastly,

'Clauses 23 and 24 which provide protection to ryots, even if partial against the ravages of money-lenders.'

That of course is a matter which is beyond the province of the ryots' representatives, to save the ryots from these plutocrats and money-lenders.

A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908, 295
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL NO. 12 OF 1931)

1st November 1933] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

“Therefore, I am appealing now particularly to the hon. the Revenue Member, if he had not the opportunity before now of having an idea as to what it is that induced this conference to meet, what the basis of that conference that took place was and what the basis is for the demands now made by the ryots, to now at least take these facts into consideration, talk them over with the representatives who stand here and whom the Raja Sahib himself has chosen to call as ‘representatives of the ryots’ and to discuss the whole thing with them thoroughly. After all, Sir, they are not so unreasonable or confiscatory in their amendments, as the Raja Sahib would make them appear.

“He also quoted a resolution of the conference held in East Godavari and said that those ryots wanted that all the intermediaries should disappear; and he asked us whether we represent them. Sir, I wish we were really able to represent them; but unfortunately we could not see eye to eye with them in such a strongly worded resolution. In the eyes of these new advocates of the congress section of the ryots’ conference, we stand as moderates; we do not want to go as far as they want us to go; we are moderates, we are not extremist representatives of the ryots. The hon. representatives who went to England against the congress mandate to attend the Round Table Conference claimed to represent the country and to speak in the name of the country. If this Government and the Government of India thought that they were gentlemen—though they could not command any following in the country—who could represent the country, we were also recognized as ryots’ representatives by the Chief Minister himself who has called us as persons fit to represent the ryots’ interests. We, as ryots’ representatives, command much more following than those gentlemen who went as representatives of this country to England. I submit it is the policy of the Government in this, as in political matters, to slight the moderate elements. I wish, Sir, that the hon. Member for Revenue would also take note that in this agrarian dispute they were at one time trying to take into confidence the moderate representatives and trying to have their constitution for the ryots settled. If you do not want our hand of friendship, by all means reject it; but you will be doing it at your risk. I am sure the hon. the Raja Sahib must be laughing within himself when we begin to speak on behalf of the ryots, saying: ‘You people are more moderate than the most advanced sections; but you come and speak like Mr. Ranga, or somebody else in the conference.’ If such is the invitation to us and to others who have not yet joined those advanced sections, well, the country will be ready to take up that challenge; and then I am sure you should be ready to deal with men of that type, if you do not want to deal with us here and now. (Hear, hear.)

“Then, Sir, the hon. Member, the Raja of Khallikote gave us a lecture on the duties of the ryots’ representatives, and stigmatised us as agitators. And what is more, he told us that we are out for taking

12
noon.

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st November 1933]

some money from these gullible ryots, and he does not know where this money goes. I do not want to say much on that aspect, Sir, as my hon. Friend, Mr. Kumaraswami Reddiyar, intervenes now with the remark that the Raja did not mean to characterize hon. Members of this House as such”

The RAJA OF KHALLIKOTE:—“ May I make a personal explanation, Sir, I never meant to cast any insinuation on any Member of this House when I called the spokesmen of the ryots as agitators. I had in mind people who are not Members of this House.”

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ If they are not Members of this House, let my hon. friend rise up and say whether they were not Members of this Council before. He knows the persons taking part in agitations in his part of the country and he says he has succeeded in putting down the activities of those agitators. He says that there are agitators in other places but so far as his part of the country is concerned, they have been silenced by the attitude of the ryots. He may have suppressed them and he may have resources enough to suppress them. Evidently he thinks that the ryots are satisfied. I may say, Sir, it is not probably without some advantage that my hon. Friend went to England and attended the Round Table Conference. Evidently he has caught the spirit of Mr. Churchill, for he says that the people are good, the ryots are good and happy under benign zamindars and asks why these agitators should come in and create trouble. That is exactly what Mr. Churchill says with regard to the Indian problem. And treatment given to the views of Mr. Churchill will also be accorded to the advice of the Raja Sahib of Khallikote.

“ Another thing I want to say, Sir, and it is this. I want to appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member that he owes a heavy duty to the ryots. I do not want to cajole him as it were, nor do I want to threaten him. Signs are not wanting that the agrarian movement is getting out of the hands of the moderate section of the people already. The latest move on the part of the ryots taking their cue from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others of his way of thinking in other Provinces, is to do away with the zamindari system. As to whether they will succeed in their efforts; or whether the zamindars with all their man-power and the influence and resources of themselves and also of the Government behind them will be able to crush them is a matter for the future. But here we are standing between both. We have not yet become extremists, but whether we want to become extremists or not, there are others who are ready to take up that creed. I would therefore appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to follow the policy of the Secretary of State and confer with the moderate representatives and see, before it is too late, that the necessary amendment of the Act is effected in such a way as to materially satisfy the ryot. This is our offer and it is there for the hon. Member to respond to it.

A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908, 297
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL NO. 12 OF 1931)

1st November 1933] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

“ One thing more, Sir, before I close. I would request the hon. the Revenue Member to set before himself the high standard which his illustrious predecessor, Mr. Forbes, set when he introduced the Bill of 1908. The Raja of Khallikote said, that the relations between the zamindars and their tenants are like father and son and that both live in amity like a happy family, so that these agitators may not show their head. On the previous occasion the illustrious ancestor of the hon. the Chief Minister, the then Maharaja of Bobbili, made the same appeal to Mr. Forbes. He did not appeal on the ground that it was an agitator that was at the bottom of the trouble, but on the ground that, that Bill would interfere unnecessarily with the very good relations existing between the landholder and tenant. I would just appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to profit by these remarks made on the previous occasion. This is what Mr. Forbes says:—

‘ At the same time I have very much sympathy with what the Maharaja said as to the paternal relation between the zamindar and his ryots, the traditional respect with which the zamindar is treated and the genuine sympathy which he entertains for his tenant. He feels that a declaratory law would end in this that the relation between them would become quite mechanical and impersonal.

‘ These, however, are among the reasons which compel the Government to take decisive action. If all zamindars cultivated these relations, there would perhaps be little need for legislation. But circumstances are rapidly changing. The ancient zamindars are being displaced by new men who have no traditional connexion with the soil, and whose action will be guided solely by commercial or selfish motives, and who will strain the law to its utmost limits. A law is a bad law which gives opportunities for diverting its power to oppress the poor and weak. The scions too of ancient families in these days of luxury and absenteeism are estranged from their old homes and are, I fear, often actuated by similar motives.’

“ Very prophetic words I may say. If these words applied in 1907, they apply with redoubled force in 1933.

‘ Moreover unless rights are firmly fixed and declared, the slow process of erosion imperceptibly wears them away. The zamindar is the flood stream; the ryot, the river-bank. Not only in justice to a weak class who are specially in need of the protection of the strong arm, but on every ground, political and economic, the Government could not sit by impassive.’

“ These are words which I would ask the hon. the Revenue Member as the successor in office of the illustrious Mr. Forbes, to bear in mind, in dealing with this question and not brush aside what the principles for which the Government of his day stood.

“ Lastly, one other point I want to touch, Sir. The Raja Sahib said with a certain amount of self-importance and self-complacency, ‘ Here are my amendments. My party gave notice of some amendments and they are a definite improvement upon the existing Bill. Will you throw them away to the winds?’ In the first place, the statement is not correct. They are not his amendments. They are the amendments which were agreed to at the conference. They are amendments which are contained in Mr. Ramadas’s Bill. They are amendments put forward as those we are willing to discuss. To say that there is any originality

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st November 1933]

in them and that they were thought of by him is a thing which I cannot characterize otherwise than as incorrect. Coming as the statement does from a person in the position of the Chief Minister and a representative of the landholders, it will be understood by the gullible public as implying that they are his amendments. They are not. They are amendments which were agreed to as those to which we can give a chance to discuss. In your own interests you drafted them as amendments which are accepted by the tenants. But they have to be examined carefully. Many of these amendments probably will be irrelevant to the Bill, and probably you, Sir, will have to rule out some of them.

"I have nothing more to say than this one thing, Sir. I hope I am appealing to the hon. the Revenue Member not in vain. I hope he has ears to hear us and does not shut his ears against the reasonable requests of the hon. Members here. I hope that even now he would proceed with the matter in a spirit of give and take, and in regard to the various points embodied in our amendments in which he may not see eye to eye with us, he would meet us half-way and not throw them away. Let me add that opportunity should be given to the Select Committee to consider to what extent our proposals require to be embodied in the Bill and what points require to be given weight. I therefore appeal to hon. Members of this House to take into consideration everything I have urged and vote in favour of this motion."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, the motion before the House is that the Bill of which I am in charge be recommitted to the Select Committee with instructions that the provisions of what is known as Mr. Ramadas's Bill be also taken into consideration and incorporated in the Bill which is now before this House. Sir, the provisions of Mr. Ramadas's Bill fall into two classes, those which are relevant to the Bill now before the House and those which are not relevant to that Bill; for the Bill now before the House is an amending Bill and not a consolidating Bill. As regards those provisions which are not relevant to the Bill now before the House, the recommitment of this Bill to the Select Committee would not empower that Committee to take them into consideration. The other amendments are those which are relevant to the Bill which is now before the House. When this Bill was before the Select Committee, all the Members of that Committee had copies of Mr. Ramadas's Bill, and we did take into consideration those of the amendments which were brought up for consideration by the representatives of the tenants or by any other Member of the Select Committee. In the Select Committee it was made clear that it was possible to consider the provisions of Mr. Ramadas's Bill so far as they are relevant to my Bill, and in certain cases those provisions were brought forward and were considered. It is possible even now in the case of those provisions of Mr. Ramadas Pantulu's Bill which have not been embodied in the Bill by the Select Committee, to bring forward

A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908, 299
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL NO. 12 OF 1931)

1st November 1933] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

amendments that is to say, amendments which are relevant to my Bill. I do not think therefore that any good purpose will be served by recommitting my Bill to the Select Committee for further consideration in connexion with such of the provisions of Mr. Ramadas Pantulu's Bill as are relevant to my Bill, because the Select Committee had already had ample opportunity to consider them."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the Bill of Sir Archibald Campbell be recommitted to the Select Committee with an instruction that the provisions of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti's Bill be also taken into consideration and incorporated into the Bill of Sir Archibald Campbell."

The motion was declared lost.

A poll was demanded by Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan, and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 15 Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar. |
| 2 Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 16 „ Moulvi Hafeez Anumanthakudi |
| 3 Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. | Mustapha Ahmed Meeran. |
| 4 Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 17 Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 5 „ T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 18 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 6 „ V. T. Arasu. | 19 „ M. S. Sreshta. |
| 7 „ A. B. Shetty. | 20 „ P. V. Krishnappa Choudari. |
| 8 Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 21 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. |
| 9 Rao Sahib A. S. Alagannan Chettiyar. | 22 Mr. C. Indriah. |
| 10 Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. | 23 „ J. Kuppuswami Choudari. |
| 11 „ U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. | 24 „ Mahboob Ali Baig. |
| 12 „ K. P. V. S. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar. | 25 „ G. R. Premayya. |
| 13 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder. | 26 „ K. Pattabhiramayya. |
| 14 „ P. Peddiraju. | 27 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu. |
| | 28 Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| | 29 „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahmud Usman. | 16 Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam. |
| 2 „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar. | 17 Mr. M. Devadasan. |
| 3 „ Sir Archibald Campbell. | 18 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj. |
| 4 „ Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 19 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 5 „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 20 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan. |
| 6 „ Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 21 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 7 „ the Raja of Bobbili. | 22 Mr. P. C. Moses. |
| 8 Rao Bahadur V. N. Viswanatha Rao. | 23 „ P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. |
| 9 Mr. J. A. Thorne. | 24 „ V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. |
| 10 „ H. M. Hood. | 25 Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur. |
| 11 Diwan Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar. | 26 Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi. |
| 12 Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 27 „ G. Lakshmana Reddi. |
| 13 „ E. Conran Smith. | 28 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. |
| 14 „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. | 29 Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri. |
| 15 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 30 The Raja of Khalikote. |
| | 31 Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. |
| | 32 „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| | 33 „ K. M. Duraiswami Reddiyar. |

300 A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908,
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL NO. 12 OF 1931)

[1st November 1933]

Noes—cont.

34 Mr. J. A. Davis.	43 S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
35 „ Daniel Thomas.	44 Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi.
36 „ H. M. Jagannathan.	45 Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
37 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti.	46 „ C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
38 Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.	47 Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
39 „ C. Jayaram Nayudu.	48 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chetti-
40 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai	yar.
Pillai.	49 Mr. R. M. Palat.
41 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.	50 „ W. W. Ladden.
42 „ Pandit Ganala Rama-	51 „ R. Foulkes.
murti.	52 „ Gade Simhachalam

Ayes 29. Noes 52.

The motion was lost.

12-15 p.m. * Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—“ Sir, Mr. President, undaunted by the phalanx of Government and Justice Party I come again to the Government and the Justice Party expecting at least fair treatment in this humble and modest request of mine. I propose—

‘that the Minutes of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Madras Estates Land Act, 1908, for certain purposes (Bill No. 12 of 1931) be made available to the Members at once.’

“ I do not know under what category of motions my hon. Friend, the hon. the Revenue Member, will look upon this motion whether revolutionary or confiscatory or expropriatory. In any case, I consider as a Member of Council, one is entitled to look at the proceedings of the Select Committee to enable him to form his judgment on the question before the House. If the answer is going to be, ‘Try as you may, you are only crying in the forest of men. We shall go on setting aside all your request,’ I can only appeal to you, Sir, Mr. President, whether you do not consider this request at least reasonable, at least reasonable enough that you might add your influential voice in this matter and ask the Government to make the proceedings available. I am of opinion, Sir, that in this matter the President can usefully intervene so that the information available with the Government ought not to be precluded from being available to us in order to arrive at some decision with regard to the very important matter coming up for discussion. Perhaps, the proceedings of the Committee when published will be able to throw much light over the manner in which each question was brought and how the final conclusion was arrived at in which case, the progress of the Bill will be considerably facilitated. I, therefore, move, Sir, that the proceedings of the Select Committee be made available.”

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—“ I rise to second the amendment moved by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. The amendment is that the proceedings of the Select Committee be made available to the Members of the House. I had the privilege of attending the meetings of the Select Committee though I was not elected as one of the Members of the Select Committee to sit on this Bill; therefore I am in a position to state that a perusal of the minutes of the Select Committee would certainly help members of this House to assess the implications and the importance of

1st November 1933]

[Mr. V. T. Arasu]

the various clauses. I would also add that the notes on the various clauses prepared by the Secretariat should also be made available to Members. For, it would considerably help us to understand the implications of the amendments that the Government have now proposed to this Bill. Therefore, I join with my Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, in appealing to the hon. the Revenue Member to make the Select Committee proceedings, which are only, I believe, about 100 pages of cyclostyled matter, available to the Members of the House."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, if it is the general desire of the House to have copies of these minutes of the meetings of the Select Committee as recorded by the Secretary to the Council, I have no wish to withhold the information from the House. I believe the proceedings will be placed before the Members to-morrow morning."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I must express my deep appreciation and thanks for the very great concession the hon. the Revenue Member has shown to this House."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"As the Government have agreed to the circulation of the proceedings of the Select Committee, and as the House seems to be unanimously of opinion that the proceedings should be circulated, I shall have them circulated in print, if possible at 11 a.m. to-morrow. In the circumstances, the hon. Member need not press his motion."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Under the circumstances, I do not press the motion to a division."

The main motion that the Bill further to amend the Madras Estates Land Act, 1908, for certain purposes (Bill No. 12 of 1931) be taken into consideration was put to the vote of the House and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, may I, having regard to the promise made by the hon. the Revenue Member that these proceedings will be made available to the Council and as it is only right that those proceedings must be made available to the House, suggest that the Council may adjourn till to-morrow morning and the Bill be proceeded with afterwards."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I also support the suggestion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It has been agreed on either side that copies of the proceedings of the Select Committee should be made available to the hon. Members to-morrow morning."

The House is adjourned till 11 o'clock to-morrow.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.